DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 244 504 EC 162 824

| | |
|---|---|
| TITLE | "A Sense of Pride." Establishing a Foxfire Adapted Model of Experientially Based Career Education for Handicapped Youth. Final Report. |
| INSTITUTION | Institutional Development and Economic Affairs Service, Inc. Nederland, CO. |
| SPONS AGENCY | Special Education Programs (ED/OSERS), Washington, DC. |
| PUB DATE | Feb 83 |
| GRANT | G007903015 |
| NOTE | 43p. |
| PUB TYPE | Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) |
| EDRS PRICE | MF01/PC02 Plus Postage. |
| DESCRIPTORS | *Community Resources; *Disabilities; *Experiential Learning; *Program Implementation; Secondary Education; *Student Developed Materials; Student Projects; Writing Skills |
| IDENTIFIERS | Foxfire |

ABSTRACT

The progress and achievements are detailed of three sites that implemented a modified Foxfire approach (a community-based experiential learning model invloving students in community research, interviewing, writing, publishing, and marketing their own magazine). Handicapped high schoolers interviewed and photographed successful handicapped adults, and wrote articles on service providers and community resources. The model emphasizes career education concepts, basic skills attainment, and affective development. Each of the four replication sites in Colorado is described in terms of summary accomplishments, program structure (project staff, student participants, project activities, facilities), parent participation, advisory councils, administrative support, community support, and evaluation. A second section reviews dissemination activities, including collaboration with colleges to offer practica. Information on evaluation is divided into program assessment and responsive evaluation. A concluding section describes primary conditions (such as administrative support and appropriate instructional staffing) that contribute to successful implementation of the model. (CL)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED244504

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

*"A SENSE OF PRIDE"*

# Establishing a Foxfire Adapted Model of Experientially Based Career Education for Handicapped Youth

FINAL REPORT

Project #: 4430H90175
Grant #: G007903015

IDEAS
Institutional Development and Economic
Affairs Service Inc.

Nederland, Colorado

February 1983

EC 162824

*"At home, I kept to myself. I couldn't talk with members of my family, especially my father. In elementary school, when I started school, they put me in EH class. I stayed there until I began in the Foxfire class.*

*"I didn't read or anything. School was boring. My father was always on my case until the fifth grade. He thought it was important. But then he didn't bother anymore, and my mom didn't make us go. In junior high I missed a lot of school. I just stayed home.*

*"Foxfire was hard at first, but once I realized I had to do it, to get my story done, I liked it. There are so many things to do. They don't give me enough work to do in my other classes.*

*"My mom notices the changes. And teachers who have heard about me . . . my brothers' teachers, they notice. They tell me that I talk more and that I listen better. If I would have stayed in EH, I would be at the same place. Foxfire moved me on. It's helped me to take notes in other classes. I remember things because of the deadlines.*

*"My dad wants to send me to college next year. I'll graduate this year and I think I might like to teach cooking."*

Karen, Wickerwire Student

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

*As you read our magazine you will find that it is a different kind of world than ours. The handicapped have problems just like everyone else, but their problems take patience . . . It takes a lot of caring and concern.*

An Aspen Glow Student

Much of the concern regarding the education of handicapped youth has been based upon a recognition that truly effective program efforts need to provide basic skills acquisition in a manner that is attentive also to affective development. To the extent that a relationship exists between cognitive and affective growth, innovative approaches to the education of the handicapped which address both areas in mutually reinforcing and individually motivating fashions are in particular demand.

"A Sense of Pride," IDEAS' three-year Office of Special Education-Handicapped Children's Model Program was designed "to develop and refine a community-based, experiential learning model based on adaptation and modification of the Foxfire Learning Process to service special education students who are often not reached through conventional classroom instruction." This goal was to be accomplished by implementing adaptations of Foxfire in three school districts in Colorado which in turn would serve as national model projects from which dissemination and replication would originate.

The need for innovative approaches to career education, basic skills attainment, and affective development of handicapped students was addressed through this adaptation of the Foxfire concept. The adapted model involved handicapped high school students in community research, interviewing, writing, publishing, and marketing of their own magazine. Students were staffed into projects concentrating upon Foxfire techniques and received academic credit for their participation in such activities as photographing and conducting interviews with working handicapped adults who achieved successful career and lifestyle adjustments in a wide range of endeavors. Articles produced by the students also profiled service providers to the handicapped, as well as local community members with experiences particularly relevant to the individual youths involved. Students returned to the classroom, developed their photographs, transcribed the taped interviews, wrote their articles, and arranged their layout of the magazine. Once printed, the magazines were marketed by the young people throughout their community, as well as nationally.

Total program development time was forty months (including a four-month no-cost time extension). During this time period, IDEAS initiated three separate and distinct projects, servicing a range of handicapped youth.

Aspen Glow, the first program implemented, is now in its third year of operation and is financially and programmatically self-sufficient. The project is a full-time, district-wide, alternative curriculum offering, currently serving fifty-one students in the Arapahoe-Littleton school district. These students attend one of two program sessions (two class periods) per day. The project is adequately staffed by three teachers, two aides, and part-time support staff (psychologist and language specialist) and enjoys strong administrative and parental support. Aspen Glow has provided training and technical assistance to other, more recently developed projects in Colorado and elsewhere.

A second project, Wickerwire, is in its second year of operation. Considered successful by the teachers and administrators of the Pueblo School District #60 in meeting the special education/career education needs of the educationally handicapped student, plans are currently being made to expand the project's servicing capabilities. During its first year of operation, the project served the needs of educationally handicapped students in one high school, Centennial. During the second year it was determined that an insufficient number of educationally handicapped students existed at Centennial to adequately staff the program. Consequently, plans are being made to move the project to the Keating School, a magnet school housing other alternative and vocational programs for the district. This change will allow the project to draw handicapped students from Pueblo's other schools while permitting the involvement of other categories of handicapped students.

The third project is also in its second year of operation. During the first year the project was developed as a collaborative effort between special education students at Englewood High School and returning dropout special education students at the Colorado's Finest Alternative High School. Although the project enjoyed a successful first year, programmatic changes were deemed necessary during the second year, due to a high turnover among the returning dropout special education students. The project now serves fifteen in-school special education students (two sessions) at Englewood High School and includes a separate satellite mini-project at the alternative school. As in the case of Aspen Glow, the project enjoys excellent administrative and parental support. The project is staffed with one teacher and one aide at Englewood and one teacher at the alternative school.

As is evident in this report, dissemination activities concerning the model projects have been extensive and include wide distribution of the student-produced magazines, national and local exposure through media coverage (articles in newspapers and trade publications), presentations at national conferences and to state and local community/civic organizations, site visits by interested educators, and various project-initiated activities. A summer Foxfire workshop for teachers, conducted in collaboration with Lewis and Clark College in Portland, Oregon, generated additional dissemination/replication of the adapted Foxfire model. The response from special educators has been significant. Nationally, several school districts have indicated interest in replication of the model.

Divided into four parts, this final report discusses, initially, the operational progress to date (February 1981-December 31, 1982). A second section concerns dissemination activities, and the final portions address program evaluation and conclusions drawn from the project's operation. Two earlier documents dealt with the program's progress through February of 1981.

TABLE OF CONTENTS


I. PROGRESS TO DATE 1

A. Arapahoe-Littleton (Aspen Glow) 1

1. Summary 1
2. Program Structure 2

a. Project Staff 2
b. Student Participants 2
c. Project Activities 3
d. Facilities 5

3. Parent Participation 5
4. Advisory Council 6
5. Administrative Support 6
6. Community Support 6
7. Evaluation 6

B. Pueblo (Wickerwire) 7

1. Summary 7
2. Program Structure 8

a. Project Staff 8
b. Student Participants 8
c. Project Activities 8
d. Facilities 9

3. Parent Participation 10
4. Advisory Council 11
5. Administrative Support 11
6. Community Support 12
7. Evaluation 12

C. Englewood (Little Dry Creek) 12

1. Summary 12
2. Program Structure 12

a. Project Staff 12
b. Student Participants 13
c. Project Activities 13
d. Facilities 14

3. Parent Participation 15
4. Advisory Council 15
5. Administrative Support 15
6. Community Support 15
7. Evaluation 15

D. Overall Project Configurations 17

II. DISSEMINATION ACTIVITIES 18

III. EVALUATION 20

A. Program Assessments 20

1. Teacher Assessments of Student Progress at Year-End 20
2. Ongoing Assessments of Students' Group and Individual Behaviors 23
3. Teacher-Developed Tests 23
4. Analysis of Individual Educational Plan (IEP) 23
5. Parents Assessment 24
6. Participant Tracking and Program Impact 25

B. Responsive Evaluation 26

1. Experiential Process Issues 27
2. Operational Issues, Expectations and Serendipity 30
3. Checklist Items and Other Primary Concerns 35

IV. CONCLUSION 36

I. PROGRESS TO DATE: February 1981 - December 31, 1982

A. Arapahoe-Littleton (Colorado) School District #6 (Aspen Glow)

> *I think a handicapped person has to come around and say to himself, "This is the way I am, and this is the way I'm going to be. Now how do I find other ways to make up for what I do not have?"*
>
> from *Aspen Glow*

1. Summary

The Foxfire-adapted program for special education in Arapahoe-Littleton School District #6--named Aspen Glow by the students--is in its third year of operation and continues to demonstrate significant impact upon student learning and behavior, retention of special education teachers and prevention of teacher burnout, parental support and involvement, and in educational programming and attitudes of school district administrators and school building personnel. School administrators and project staff have expanded the project into a full-time, alternative curriculum offering. In addition, the project focus is being expanded to include other forms of media such as video/film. Aspen Glow's teachers have already attended inservice training provided by KMRA (Channel 6) in Denver. Depending on available school district resources and resource development activities, plans are also being made to utilize microcomputers for project business/operational use, as well as a means for job related skills training.

Despite some initial obstacles (the project was staffed with severely emotionally disturbed, motivational problem students and had inadequate facilities for program activities), child change was pervasive and all encompassing. Some child change vignettes follow:

> *One hearing-impaired student who came into the program with a record of D's and F's in school work and poor communication abilities was headed, according to school personnel, for continued failure due to skill deficiencies and a negative attitude. Since his involvement in Aspen Glow, his speech has improved, he displays self-confidence, and he can boast of all passing grades.*
>
> *Parents of one Aspen Glow student stated that they have seen their son do things he never did before: "He's starting to do his homework without being told; he displays a tremendous sense of confidence about himself and his relationships with other people."*
>
> *A mother of another Aspen Glow student said that her son previously became very frustrated academically. This increased level of frustration led, in turn, to a poorer record of academic accomplishment and further frustration. Aspen Glow created for this student moments of progressive reinforcement of his skills and abilities.*

*One Aspen Glow student began the year hyperactive, anti-social, and prone to fighting physically with his peers. He was easily distracted and uncooperative. Towards publication time, the teachers reported that he had made considerable adjustment. He would slip away to the library in order to complete his work and communicated more with his teachers and peers. He exhibited increased self-confidence, as well as trust in his teachers and peers.*

IDEAS initially felt that the project might lose two of the three teachers due to "burnout." However, all of the teachers continued with the program. (One teacher is currently on maternity leave.) One of the instructors began the program with the intention it would be her final year of teaching, but has changed her mind and is now continuing postgraduate studies in addition to fulfilling her instructional responsibilities. All have stated they would not return to the resource room situation from which they were recruited.

While the school district was reluctant in the beginning of the program's implementation to commit resources and facilities, the Office of Special Services is now providing the project more than adequate staff (three special education teachers, two full-time aides, one part-time psychologist, one curriculum and diagnostic specialist), supplemental resources (word processing support services, inservicing training for teachers, printing and graphic arts equipment), and a separate facility for program operations.

Finally, an unexpected outcome of this project was a high level of parental support and involvement.

2. Program Structure

a. Project Staff

As mentioned, the three special education teachers responsible for Aspen Glow's operation are supplemented by two teacher aides. A parent of one of the original students functions in this capacity, having volunteered for the position. In addition to the project staff, a school district psychologist conducts group sessions with students on a weekly basis, and a district specialist conducts diagnostic services and develops Foxfire-related activities on the basis of the test results.

b. Student Participants

For the balance of the 1980-81 school year, twenty special education students and seven regular education students continued in the program. It was intended in the original proposal to involve some regular education students for mainstreaming purposes. The cost of servicing the regular education students was assumed by the school district.

During the 1981-82 school year, thirty-nine special education students and one regular education student participated in the program; twenty attended during the morning session and twenty in the afternoon session. Of the twenty original students, eleven continued in the program for a

second year. Nine of the original students matriculated to the Area Vocational Schools or continued enrollment on a full-time basis in their respective schools, attending regular education classes. Participant makeup during this period consisted of seven girls and thirty-three boys; thirteen students were in the tenth grade and twenty-seven were ninth graders. All of the special education students were diagnosed as having specific learning disabilities (primarily perceptual/communicative disorders). Thirty percent were also emotionally/behaviorally disturbed. The degree of handicapping severity ranged from moderate (seventy percent) to severe (thirty percent). Four students were also physically handicapped (visual and minimal brain damage).

During the current school year, the project is serving fifty-one students--forty in special education and eleven in regular education. There are ten girls and forty-one boys. All of the currently enrolled special education students have specifically diagnosed learning disabilities, and fifty percent are severely emotionally/behaviorally disturbed.

c. Project Activities

During the remainder of the 1981-82 school year, students continued to develop their stories and interviews for the second issue of their magazine. Each student was responsible for his/her own story. With increasing confidence and newly acquired skills, students produced a second issue (see Appendices for copy of *Aspen Glow, Vol. I No. II*). Unlike the first semester, there were minimal behavioral problems. Behavioral modification techniques resorted to during the first semester were abandoned because they did not work, and because they were no longer necessary.

IDEAS' technical assistance during this period focused on marketing/sales strategies and dissemination activities, with a marketing and sales seminar being conducted by IDEAS' staff. Students began making presentations of their project to various community groups, including a presentation to probation officers and correctional personnel in the Denver metropolitan area. A brochure concerning the project (see Appendices) was developed by the young people as well as a slide presentation and a mailing list. Brochures were sent to area handicapped organizations and community groups. Newspaper articles concerning the project appeared in *The Littleton Independent*, *The Denver Post*, and the nationally circulated special education publication, *Counterpoint* (see Appendices).

As of this date, the first issue of *Aspen Glow* is sold out. Student resource development activities included production of *Aspen Glow* T-shirts, also sold out. Over and above these marketing activities, students sold their magazines door-to-door throughout their neighborhood. Most of these students were previously shy and afraid to talk to other people, by their own admission. One particular student, with minimal brain damage, a lazy eye, and a history of failure in school, sold thirty magazines during a door-to-door campaign.

Resource development activities for the 1981-82 school year included publication of *Great Chefs of Littleton*, a cookbook featuring favorite recipes from the community and from foreign students at the Springs

Institute for International Studies. Foreign students visited the project for one-on-one interactions and camaraderie. *Great Chefs of Littleton* is also sold out. Through such efforts the project raised enough funds to underwrite production/publication of their third issue of *Aspen Glow* (see Appendices).

The teachers and students devoted time during the beginning of the 1981-82 school year for organizational activities, including developing a bookkeeping system and a circulation/subscription/filing system. Students began to move into new areas of learning and increased levels of responsibility.

Finally, another significant activity which illustrates the ever increasing and broadening areas of involvement characteristic of the Foxfire process centers upon peer learning and teaching. Two students from Aspen Glow assisted in the training of educationally handicapped students who were beginning their own Foxfire project in Pueblo, Colorado (Wickerwire). After a hectic week of training a dozen "acting-out," behaviorally disruptive students, one of the student trainers from Aspen Glow asked an IDEAS' staff member, "Were we that bad when we first started?" IDEAS' personnel responded, "What do you think?" and the student replied, "Yes, we were." Students began experiencing the "other side." Another student trainer's reaction was, "I would hate to be a teacher. It's terrible when they don't pay attention."

By the end of the 1980-81 school year, students began to call their teachers/advisors by their first names. Once the students began experiencing "the other side," teachers began to be seen in terms beyond simply that of authority figures.

In March 1981, a student and teacher from Aspen Glow spent a week of program inservice at Three-Wire Winter, a Foxfire project in Steamboat Springs, Colorado. Students from Three-Wire Winter had helped train the original group of Aspen Glow students.

During the summer of 1981, another Aspen Glow student assisted in training thirty teachers, including special education instructors, enrolled in a Foxfire seminar offered by Lewis and Clark College of Portland, Oregon in collaboration with IDEAS. Needless to say, it was a valuable learning experience for this student.

IDEAS began in September 1981 another Foxfire project for in-school special education students and dropout special education students in neighboring Englewood, Colorado. Aspen Glow students and teachers assisted in the one-week intensive Foxfire training workshop which initiated this program. A total of ten students were involved in this opportunity. Students from Aspen Glow continue to provide technical assistance to students in the Englewood project. In October 1981, IDEAS started a Foxfire/HEP (High School Equivalency Program) integrated model in Woodburn, Oregon, which combines the Foxfire process with GED preparation. Designed for out-of-school migrant (Hispanic and Russian) youths, the thrust of the program is GED preparation, post-secondary access, and career exploration. Again, an Aspen Glow student and teacher helped in the initial Foxfire training, which provided the student exposure to different cultures while, at the same time, moving him to other levels of learning and responsibility.

Still another Foxfire program was started by IDEAS in January 1982. Serving Indochinese refugees and other foreign students in Boulder High School, Boulder, Colorado, the objectives of this adaptation are to use the Foxfire process in English As a Second Language (ESL) classes, to instill in new immigrants a sense of pride in their ethnic heritage, and to dispel the innocent ignorance of most Americans about various aspects of Indochinese and other foreign cultures. Following his role as a student Foxfire trainer for this project, the Aspen Glow student involved commented, "It transformed my life. Look at all these kids and what they've gone through in life. How can I complain about my own?"

In addition to developing a new sense of confidence for the students who participate in such training workshops, these young people are given an opportunity to examine other cultures, other situations, and to gain new perspectives on what lies ahead for them. There are new possibilities to pursue, and new challenges to face. A growing network of young adults, whether handicapped or not, in school or out, Anglo, Hispanic, Russian, or refugee, sharing a common inspiration and vision is beginning to seed. Participating students in the Foxfire-adapted model for special education are joining this growing network of young people.

d. Facilities

Facilities remain adequate. The project enjoys the sole use of 3,200 square feet of space next to the Office of Special Services. This facility is located in downtown Littleton, across from the post office and bank and a block away from the school district print shop. Public transportation is readily accessible. Two large rooms are used primarily for publication production and a professional darkroom and separate layout/graphics area are for Aspen Glow's use. In addition, there are three smaller rooms available. One is used as a teacher's office; one houses the dictaphones and project telephone; the final room is used for storage of magazines and other resources. The school district has provided a telephone, furniture, typewriters, and file cabinets. During the program expansion phase, the school district also provided additional tape recorders and other equipment. This expansion of the project into a full-time alternative program serving twice the number of students (morning and afternoon sessions) was made possible because of the adequacy of facilities. Students continue to be transported by bus from their respective schools.

3. Parent Participation

Parent participation and support have been excellent. Regular contacts with parents are made, and parents continue to provide feedback regarding the progress of their children. The production of *Great Chefs of Littleton* was a collective effort involving parents and members of the community. Parents' Night is held regularly. During the 1982-83 school year, this event was well attended not only by parents (eighty-seven parents in attendance), but also by school district administrators and advisory council members. When recent budget cuts threatened the project, support from parents and administrators came to the fore.

4. Advisory Council

The advisory council continues to display a keen interest in the project. Council members provide regular feedback regarding program operations, and they also participate in Parents' Night.

5. Administrative Support

Administrative support and commitment of resources where necessary have been excellent. The Director of Special Services, Dennis Svaldi, continued, during his tenure, to be responsive to the changing needs of the project. However, toward the end of the 1982-83 school year, Mr. Svaldi resigned from his position. The school district is currently undergoing severe budget cuts, and Aspen Glow was perceived by some to be threatened. Strong parental support and advocacy for the program persuaded administrators to maintain the program, however.

6. Community Support

Strong community support for the program exists. Publication of *Great Chefs of Littleton* and the resulting involvement of local businesses, restaurants, and community members have had positive effect on the project. Materials collected by the students in preparation of their stories (photos, artifacts, etc.) are being housed at the Littleton Historical Museum, a fact in which students take pride.

7. Evaluation

A year-end teacher assessment of student progress was conducted (see sample in the Appendices), using a rating scale and open-ended questions. Items included in the assessment are:

attitude toward school/academics,
improvement in self-image,
personal growth and self-understanding,
ability to relate and communicate with others,
self-confidence and confidence in abilities,
sense of responsibility,
students' sense of independence and self-reliance,
overall motivation, and
what worked or did not work in the program for the student.

Teacher assessments of the overall benefits of the project for both teachers and students, technical assistance provided, inservice needs, and project's structural/operational effectiveness were also conducted.

Assessments of students' group and individual behaviors were conducted on a daily basis (see form in Appendices). Behaviors monitored include:

punctuality (students use a time clock),
organization,

job performance,
completion of daily assignments,
following directions and program rules, and
appropriate interaction with adults and peers.

Teachers also developed a test to determine participant knowledge of Foxfire-related skills (see Appendices). Regular staffings for each individual student were conducted to determine progress of the participant relative to the Individual Educational Plan, and/or to determine if modifications in the Individual Educational Plan were necessary. A sample Individual Educational Plan is included in the Appendices.

Parental assessments were also conducted. Parents were asked to describe how they felt their child benefited from participating in Aspen Glow and to communicate other issues they felt were relevant.

Finally, consistent with responsive evaluation methodology, year-end interviews were conducted with students, teachers, parents, and administrators. Interviews focused on benefits of the program to students, operational issues, management issues, and other issues as outlined in IDEAS' responsive evaluation plan.

An analysis of teacher assessment and responsive evaluation data, including self-assessment portfolios, will be discussed in a separate section. This same evaluation methodology is utilized (both process and summative) for each project's benefit.

## B. Pueblo (Colorado) School District #60 (Wickerwire)

> *"I felt really strange going into the police station. For a change, I wasn't under arrest! As I sat waiting to interview Officer Leyva, I thought about the other times I had been there under less pleasant circumstances."*
>
> from *Wickerwire*

### 1. Summary

Wickerwire, the model project begun by IDEAS in Pueblo, Colorado, is demonstrating significant impact on student learning and behavior. Despite an initial lack of adequate facilities, lack of school administrative/school building support, and lack of teaching resources, the group of twelve students initially involved has persisted. IDEAS' staff noted that these students could have easily given up, considering the length of time required to complete the finished product, the skill level with which the participants began, and the fact that most of their teachers considered them incapable of the task. The only truly demonstrable commitment came from the students themselves and the Wickerwire instructors. As one of the teachers noted, "This program has worked something just short of a miracle for almost all of the kids. They have all come out of themselves so much that they don't seem like the same bunch we started with. What's

even more wonderful is that they know it themselves. There is a lot of pride in these students now; there's even self-motivation and that was definitely lacking last year. I know that something right is happening, and I want to thank you for giving me the chance to be part of it."

As mentioned previously, plans are being made to move the project to the Keating School which houses alternative and vocational special education programs for the district. This change will allow the project to serve educationally handicapped students from Pueblo schools in addition to Centennial High School while involving other categories of handicapped participants.

2. Program Structure

a. Project Staff

With a commitment from the school district of only one teacher and one aide, it has been difficult to provide one-on-one learning situations, particularly when such situations are required, such as in the transcription phase of Foxfire learning activities. This situation was somewhat abated by the utilization of undergraduate interns from the Education Department of the University of Southern Colorado, through the support of Dr. Margaret Miller. Undergraduate interns were available to work with student participants on a one-on-one basis for a total of thirty hours per semester for each intern. Nonetheless, this resource was limited and fluctuated and created some operational problems, described more fully in the project activities section.

To help alleviate this situation, IDEAS temporarily employed with grant funds for the second semester of the 1981-82 school year an additional part-time instructor, Ms. Kathy Davis. Ms. Davis had been previously working with the students as a student teacher.

b. Student Participants

Participants are all diagnosed as special education students with the primary handicapping condition being that of an emotionally disturbed nature. Initially, twelve students were involved in Wickerwire, six boys and six girls. Since the second semester of the 1980-81 school year, three students have dropped from the program. One enrolled in work study, one student married, and one became pregnant and dropped out of school. Of this original group, ten were Anglo and two were Hispanic. The age range was sixteen to eighteen. All of the students were three to four grade levels behind in language and math skills. About fifty percent of the students were moderately behaviorally disruptive.

For the 1982-83 school year, the group dwindled to seven students, of which five are returning students. Consequently, plans are underway to relocate and centralize the project in order that Wickerwire can draw participants from all of the district's secondary schools and maximize its impact.

c. Project Activities

Second semester activities for the 1980-81 school year concentrated upon

Foxfire activities including refinement of photography skills, conducting community, career, and cultural research, interviewing, transcribing, story development, peer training of new students and remediation of specifically weak skill areas. Students also composed letters to friends and relatives, explaining the project and soliciting subscriptions (see Appendices for sample letter of solicitation).

Media exposure was arranged by *Insights*, the University of Southern Colorado Newspaper (see Appendices). Supplementary activities were initiated by the teachers and students. *Wickerwire* was chosen as the name for the magazine by a student vote. Wickwire was the previous name of the steel mill in Pueblo (now C.F.& I.). Students misread it as Wickerwire, but liked the name.

During the first semester of the 1981-82 school year, students continued the aforementioned activities, concentrating on transcription and story development. Due to the low language skill levels, one-on-one tutoring occurred as resources permitted. Transcription and story development were arduous tasks for most of these students. To provide the students a boost in morale, visits to the Littleton and Englewood projects were arranged at the beginning of the school year. During one of these experiences at Aspen Glow, Wickerwire students expressed frustration over the transcription process and wanted to know what would make the task less painful. The response from an Aspen Glow student was direct: "Transcription is the hardest part of all you have to do to put a magazine out. Why don't you just do it, and get it over with, so you can go to the other fun parts?" At Englewood, Wickerwire students played volleyball with students and shared similar experiences.

IDEAS provided layout training during the second semester of the 1981-82 school year, which allowed students who had completed their story development to procede with the next phase of production. These students, in turn, assisted others as they completed their stories. The publication, *Wickerwire*, was published in February of 1982 (see Appendices). For the balance of the 1981-82 school year, the emphasis for project activities shifted to marketing and circulation, development of a recordkeeping system, and development of participant organizational skills. Students also continued to interview, transcribe, and develop stories for a second issue. These activities continued into the 1982-83 school year.

An additional learning activity was made available, operating a word processor. Access to the word processor is being provided currently as a means of assessing its impact upon the teaching of reading and writing. Wickerwire students enter their stories into the word processor and edit their text on the monitor. The word processor is an interactive machine and is capable of informing the user if a word is misspelled. Wickerwire students often refuse this option, preferring instead to discover errors themselves. This opportunity is having apparent significant impact on student learning.

d. Facilities

For the 1981-82 school year facilities were less than ideal. Students

worked out of a small office as a group and were individually dispersed throughout the Media Center, an open, semi-public space. There was no "definition" relative to class space, making is difficult for participants to identify with their project. During the course of the initial semester of operation, students were required by Media Center personnel to wear red badges while they were occupying the Media Center. This procedure labeled and "singled out" the Foxfire students. While efforts were made by IDEAS' staff to convert the badges into a positive honor, school personnel failed to cooperate. Finally, through a series of negotiations and meetings with building personnel and presentations by the lead teacher to other faculty members, this situation was resolved.

By the beginning of the 1981-82 school year, with enough time to plan class schedules, facilities were no longer an issue, and students resumed project activities with minimal operational problems. Commitment and support from administration and building personnel began to build following publication of the first magazine issue. For the 1982-83 school year, the Wickerwire teacher has been assigned to teach a journalism class. Foxfire students now have access to the facilities of this journalism class, including the darkroom, one large classroom, and a small adjacent room, ideal for transcription. With plans to centralize the project at Keating School, facilities will again change and hopefully be adequate for the anticipated expansion.

3. Parent Participation

Parent participation and support of Wickerwire has been excellent. Parents' Night was first held on May 28, 1981, and scheduled regularly thereafter. Students plan the program and prepare refreshments for the parents. Each student is assigned one table in the Media Center where they display their work. They also teach their parents the film developing and photograph development processes. Two bulletin boards prepared by the students exhibit photographs taken during interviews and other activities.

Students and teachers were initially apprehensive about attendance for these events. The lead teacher contacted all parents prior to the first Parent's Night. One of the students called his parents to see if they were coming and was told they were not. Disappointed, he responded, "Well, if my parents aren't coming, I'm not coming either, because I already know what's going on." However, during Parents' Night he appeared anyway, nicely groomed. Total attendance surpassed eighty percent and included parents, brothers, and sisters. Mr. Sel Elizondo, the Director of Mentally Handicapped Programs, has also been present at these events and has expressed surprise at the turnout which he placed normally at ten percent for Special Education events in the Pueblo District. He has been impressed even more by the extent of parental support. The programs include a brief orientation by IDEAS' staff and the lead teacher. Mock interviewing is conducted by one of the students with a parent. Parents are then divided into groups and taken to the darkroom where they are taught how to develop and print photographs. A student takes photographs throughout the evening and the students show their parents how to process and print the pictures.

Parents continue to be extremely supportive of the project, relating changes

in their children's behavior and attitudes toward school. A most dramatic transformation can be seen in L. Two of his siblings were also in the program. The mother believes that participation in Foxfire has changed L's motor coordination. The father has stated that all of his children like the program--which surprises him because there has been very little about school that they enjoyed previously. This family is of a low income, welfare-dependent status. The lead teacher describes them as "so poor that they sometimes cannot afford food and often go hungry." Parents have offered to help the students transcribe and type their material.

In April 1982, another Parents' Night was held to celebrate the publication of the magazine. Testimonials from the parents were again strong and enthusiastic. They insisted that the program be continued and that their children participate. Typical comments included:

*"My kid is getting better grades in his other classes."*

*"The only teacher I know is Manzaneras (Wickerwire's lead teacher), because that's all my daughter talks about at home."*

*"My son has so much more self-confidence."*

*"My kid used to sit in front of the TV and always kept asking her father, 'What's happening?' Her father would get mad, saying, 'What's the matter with you. Why don't you watch what is going on?' She wouldn't listen or pay attention. She missed things, but now she's able to grasp what's going on. She doesn't ask, 'What's happening?' when she watches TV. She knows what's going on, and I'm really pleased."*

*"I don't know what it is about this program, but I want it to continue, and I want my kid in it."*

4. Advisory Council

Project staff continued to seek the advice and guidance of the Special Education Advisory Council for Pueblo School District #60. The teacher/advisor is also organizing an adjunct Advisory Council that will include prominent citizens of Pueblo and local business people.

5. Administrative Support

The degree of administrative support of the project, coupled with apprehension and misunderstanding on the part of other faculty members at Centennial High School, remained the greatest obstacle to the success of Wickerwire. However, after the publication of the magazine, administrative support increased significantly. With plans to expand the program and centralize the location, administrative and building-level support will prove essential.

6. Community Support

Initial community support has been good, although the project is still in its early developmental stages. Community support significantly increased after publication of the first issue of the magazine in May of 1982.

7. Evaluation

An evaluation strategy similar to the one utilized in Aspen Glow is also being implemented in the Wickerwire project.

C. Englewood (Colorado) School District #1 (Little Dry Creek)

*"I love it, it's fun," said Montoya, a Wickerwire student, "but it's also a big pain. I never thought it was this hard."*

*But Chris, who dropped out of school five years ago and is now thinking of college and a possible career in journalism, is the first to admit it's been worth the effort.*

from *Englewood Sentinel*

1. Summary

Negotiations with the Englewood School District #1 were finalized (see Letter of Agreement in Appendices) in June of 1981, and orientation of teachers was subsequently conducted by IDEAS. The school district provided funds for one of the teachers to attend a Foxfire workshop at Lewis and Clark College in Portland, Oregon during July. Participation in this workshop gave the teacher initial grounding in the Foxfire process.

The Foxfire project in Englewood, Colorado (originally called Englewood Pizazz, but changed during the 1982-83 school year to Little Dry Creek) is showing significant impact on student learning and behavior. While structural problems in the program existed during its first year, re-organization was undertaken at the beginning of the 1982-83 school year. Developed as a collaborative effort between special education students at Englewood High School and returning dropout special education students at the Colorado's Finest Alternative High School, a high turnover rate within the returning dropout group necessitated programmatic changes. The project now serves fifteen in-school special education students (two sessions) at Englewood High School and includes a satellite mini-project at the alternative school. As in the case of Aspen Glow, the project enjoys excellent administrative and parental support.

2. Program Structure

a. Project Staff

For its first year of operation, the project staff consisted of three

instructors. Two of the teachers had backgrounds in photography and one teacher had a background in media. All were responsive to student needs and were well-respected by the students. Teachers demonstrated abilities to respond to problems and needs as they emerged. With the project's relocation to Englewood High School, staff now consists of one teacher and full-time aide at the principal site. In order to minimize student-teacher ratio, there are two class sessions. The satellite project at the alternative school is staffed by one teacher.

b. Student Participants

The alternative school's policy allowed students the option of selecting and participating in classes at any time during the academic calendar. This open entry/exit format created a structural problem for the Foxfire project. As the term progressed, IDEAS' staff noted that many of the students in the original Foxfire Training Workshop had withdrawn, either from the program or from the school entirely. On the other hand, new students continually elected to participate in the program. These new students were trained by the few remaining ones, a positive situation since it provided opportunities for peer teaching. However, this flexible structure slowed down operations considerably and created levels of frustration for both the remaining students and project staff.

Participation by alternative high school students continued to fluctuate with a total involvement remaining at about twenty students at any given time. Enrollment and participation of the in-school special education students remained constant.

With the transition to a new structural format for the 1982-83 school year, many of these problems were resolved. Little Dry Creek is currently serving fifteen special education students. All students have perceptual-communicative disorders/learning disabilities. Two are physically handicapped; fifty percent are also emotionally/behaviorally disturbed. Three-fourths of the students are in the eleventh grade, and the remainder are twelfth graders. The satellite project at the alternative high school serves five students.

c. Project Activities

During the week of September 14, 1981, IDEAS conducted a Foxfire Training Workshop for teachers and students with instructors and students from Aspen Glow assisting. A total of twenty students participated in the workshop. Twelve were selected from special education population at Englewood High School and eight recruited from Colorado's Finest Alternative High School. As mentioned, the alternative high school students were former dropout special education students, returning to school in an alternative setting. The workshop progressed satisfactorily in spite of conflicts between the two student groups.

Time limitations for the workshop were imposed upon IDEAS' trainers by the alternative school's established schedule, and necessitated that the workshop be flexibly organized in order that staff could be able to respond to situations as they arose. Students ranged in age from fifteen to

nineteen, with the group composed of twelve females (one of whom was pregnant) and eight males. Grade levels ranged from the ninth to twelfth. The students appeared enthusiastic, eager to learn, and were willing to spend time during the optional afternoon portion of the workshop. A few students not enrolled in the project were continually observed on the fringe of workshop activity, sometimes participating and sometimes distracting.

An evaluation of the workshop was conducted, utilizing IDEAS' Teacher Assessment Forms (see Appendices). Teacher assessment of the workshop was highly positive.

First semester of the 1981-82 school year encompassed project activities including the refinement of photography skills, conducting community, career, and cultural research, interviewing, transcribing, story development, peer training of new students and remediation of specific skill areas. Students also wrote letters to friends and relatives, telling them about their project and soliciting subscriptions. Media exposure was arranged by the *Englewood Sentinel* newspaper (see Appendices for article), and instructors and students initiated supplementary activities. Stories for *Englewood Pizazz* included interviews with a Denver Bronco football player, a television personality, an Englewood police officer, a radio station disc jockey, and a 101-year-old Englewood resident (see Appendices for copy of the magazine).

A unique recent development in this Foxfire adaptation is utilization of a microcomputer, purchased for the project by the school district. Students are capable of producing their own copy on a word processor, and language skill-building has been evident. The utilization of microcomputer technology has enhanced the language skills intervention existent within the Foxfire concept. Furthermore, students are provided job training in a field that is increasingly in demand.

Activities during the 1982-83 school year include magazine production, peer training of incoming students, and marketing of the first issue.

d. Facilities

Facilities for school year 1981-82 were adequate. Student work was concentrated in one classroom, but the entire alternative school was available for use. Students formed teams and utilized different rooms for a variety of project activities. While less than ideal, the darkroom was workable. Transportation of students from Englewood High School to the project site was provided by the district.

It is interesting to note the general environment in which the first-year project initiative operated. The alternative school consisted of four teachers and a curriculum that was very unstructured. Student involvement in school policy was marked, as was noticeable student pride in the school. Students interview instructors before they are hired at the school and are involved in the physical maintenance of the plant itself, casually mopping hallways, recycling pop cans, and cleaning bathroom walls. Student-comprised committees literally govern school policy and formulate rules such as one

forbidding smoking in the classrooms but permitting it in the hallways.

The involvement of "in-school" students from Englewood High School in the operation of the project at the alternative school created obvious problems. Alternative high school students were not allowed on the physical grounds of Englewood High School and felt, therefore, students from Englewood High School should not be permitted to attend the alternative school. While the site had been selected because of a district perceived need, the alternative school's structure and setting presented a unique and challenging situation. Program staff decided by the end of the school year that reorganization was needed, and the project was transferred to Englewood High School as the primary site, with a satellite component remaining at the alternative high school. Facilities at the high school are more than adequate. The classroom is sufficiently large for various activities to occur, and the darkroom is fully equipped and large enough for small group work.

3. Parent Participation

Parental support for and participation in this project are also excellent. Parents' Night will be held regularly during the 1982-83 school year.

4. Advisory Council

The Special Education Advisory Council has been regularly consulted for guidance and advice. The Council has been fully supportive of the project.

5. Administrative Support

Administrative support has been evident. A school district administrator working closely with IDEAS' staff is also the principal of the alternative high school. He has been optimistic in his support for the project. Another administrator working closely with IDEAS is Dr. James Walpole, now Director of Special Services of Englewood Public Schools. Dr. Walpole assisted in the implementation of Aspen Glow, while Assistant Director for Special Services for the Arapahoe-Littleton School District.

6. Community Support

Initial community support has been good, although the project is still in its early stages of development. Community support increased in the fall of 1982, when students developed and began implementing a marketing strategy.

7. Evaluation

An evaluation strategy similar to the one initiated at Aspen Glow is being implemented for Little Dry Creek. Responsive evaluation issues, however,

remain project-specific. The following vignettes illustrate early successes of Little Dry Creek:

> *One student, an Englewood High School junior, until this year, had never developed a picture, never conducted an interview, never written a news story, and never worked on a word processor. By her own admission, she seldom talked to anyone. After asking the questions in an interview with the 101-year-old Englewood resident living in a nursing home and writing the article that appeared in Englewood Pizazz, she attests, "You have to learn to get over it. You can't sit there and say nothing or else you feel like a fool."*
>
> *"I love it, it's fun, but it's also a big pain. I never thought it was this hard," explains another student who dropped out of school five years ago and is now considering college and a possible career in journalism. She's the first to admit it's been worth the effort. "I could hardly wait to see the finished copy. I'm going to save it for the rest of my life."*

One of the instructors summarized the project's impact as, "I'm seeing kids who are more competent in dealing with people, who are willing to pick up the phone and set up an interview. They're learning there's a world beyond their world." The teacher said, "In spite of all the frustration, it's working."

## II. DISSEMINATION ACTIVITIES

> *Aspen Glow is an independent magazine that kids with problems are putting out to prove that they are just as good as the kids that did it in the first Foxfire magazine . . .*
>
> Josh Berkowitz
> *Aspen Glow* Staff Member

Dissemination activities for "A Sense of Pride" included participation in special education conferences and handicapped/disabled coalition activities, presentations by project students to Colorado probation officers, contacts with state and local educational agencies and administrators, with community and government agencies providing services to the handicapped, with graduate programs in institutions of higher education (both in Colorado and Oregon), media presentations, and requests for information and instructional materials.

IDEAS' staff, project instructors, and student participants attended a number of conferences and gatherings including:

Colorado Council for Exceptional Children Conference in Colorado Springs in February 1981;

Lewis and Clark Foxfire Workshop in July 1981;

Coalition for People with Disabilities' planning activities for International Year of Disabled Persons (for which IDEAS is on the Subcommittee for Education) in Denver;

PDAS Topical, which IDEAS hosted in Boulder on serving populations with special needs in May 1981;

PDAS' Product Development Workshop, July 1981, in Denver;

Project Directors Conference in Washington, D.C., October 1981;

Conference on Issues in Educating the Seriously Emotionally Disturbed in Washington, D.C., March 1981; and

Conference on Replication and Continuation in Seattle, Washington, January 1982.

Articles concerning Aspen Glow and the adapted-Foxfire program appeared in several school district newsletters and school publications, including:

the *Littleton Community Newspaper*;
the PDAS Newsletter, *Connections*;
the *Denver Post*;
a newsletter called *New Directions*;
and *Counterpoint*, a trade publication for special education (national circulation).

An article on *Wickerwire* appeared in *Insight*, a University of Southern Colorado newspaper, and an article concerning Englewood Pizazz appeared in the *Littleton Sentinel*, a local newspaper.

Other dissemination activities included visits to the project site by twenty to twenty-five graduate students of the University of Colorado's School of Education (Social and Multicultural Foundations program) and teachers and administrators from area school districts. Foreign students from the Springs Institute for International Studies also visited Aspen Glow.

Expressions of interest regarding implementing this model project have come from the following (partial list):

-Adelphi University, New York City, NY
-Board of Cooperative Educational Services of Nassau County, Division of Special Education, Westbury, NY
-Utica Community Schools, Special Services, Utica, MI
-Meridian Public Schools, Exceptional Child Education, Meredian, MS
-Hawaii State Department of Education
-Cuyahoga Special Education Service Center, Maple Heights, OH
-Danvers High School, Special Education, Danvers, MA
-Kansas State Department of Education, Topeka, KS
-New York State Executive Department, Division for Youth, Rehabilitative Services, Elmira, NY
-St. Paul Public Schools, Special Education, St. Paul, MN
-Orange County Public Schools, Orlando, FL
-Lincoln-Union Educational Cooperative, Beresford, SD
-Charles Steward Mott Community College, Office of Special Programs, Flint, MI
-Intermediate School 174, Bronx, NY
-Dibold Mental Disabilities Council, Baltimore, MD
-State Mental Health and Retardation Board, Richmond, VA
-State of Connecticut Department of Mental Retardation, Tolland Region, CT
-Gwinn High School, Gwinn, MI
-Green Mountain High School, Evergreen, CO
-Lake Washington School District #414, Kirkland, WA
-Louisiana Folklife Center, Natchitoches, LA
-Psycho-Educational Project, Hutchinson, KS
-Westside Community for Independent Living, Inc., Los Angeles, CA
-West Virginia University, Morgantown, WV
-Christine Clark Reid, Monroeville, PA
-Starr School, Windsor, CA
-South Georgia College, Douglas, GA
-Greenwood School District, Millerstown, PA
-North Community School, Lake Placid, NY
-University of Southern Louisiana, Lafayette, LA

Finally, as part of IDEAS' dissemination efforts, continued collaborative relations with Lewis and Clark College have been pursued. IDEAS assisted the College in the design of an enhanced, refined Foxfire practicum offered July 6-17, 1981, dealing with the unique adaptations needed to create an effective Foxfire program for special education students. This practicum is offered every summer.

Lewis and Clark is the largest private liberal arts institution in Oregon, with an enrollment of 1,800 undergraduates, 700 law students, and 400 master's candidates in music, public administration, and education.

IDEAS assisted Lewis and Clark in the recruitment of special education teachers and administrators to the summer course and provided resources to insure its effectiveness in assisting educators design their own Foxfire adaptations for implementation at their respective school locations. Thirty educators enrolled in the summer course. Instruction was shared by IDEAS, an Aspen Glow student, and Lewis and Clark staff. IDEAS and College faculty designed the course to provide five graduate quarter-credit hours to participating educators who elected to take the entire two-week offering.

The practicum initially involved the teacher participants in "hands-on" activities typically undertaken by students in Foxfire programs, including interviewing, transcription, story writing, photography, and layout. Participants were required to produce an article of their own, just as is required of students in a Foxfire program.

The second phase of the practicum involved participants in the planning of their own Foxfire program adaptations for implementation in their respective school sites. IDEAS provided program information, resources, and relevant experience concerning the Arapahoe-Littleton, Englewood, and Pueblo, Colorado program initiatives in order to assist these educators in program planning strategies.

## III. EVALUATION

*Foxfire is my idea of an ideal situation in which a kid can learn.*

An Aspen Glow Parent

The following project evaluation is divided into two parts, the first dealing with program assessments. Most of the data for this initial section was utilized primarily for formative evaluation purposes. Discussions in this section are based upon data collected from Aspen Glow during the 1981-82 school year; however, the evaluation mechanism has also been used for subsequent projects in subsequent years of operation. The second portion of the evaluation concerns responsive evaluation, a process described in previous reports. This evaluation fromat is generic for all projects and is intended to remain as an ongoing mechanism during subsequent years of operation.

### A. Program Assessments

#### 1. Teacher Assessments of Student Progress at Year-End

Teacher assessments of student progress at year-end indicated that slight change existed in student attitude toward school/academics, with an average rating of "5" on a scale of "7". A rating of "4" indicated no change. Specific teacher observations regarding student shifts in attitude included

the following:

> *"L, who was typical of our student population, called the Special Services Administration and insisted that she wanted to be in Aspen Glow, or she would drop out of school. She explained that her family history was one of dropping out of school. We enrolled her in the program."*
>
> *"J improved in his confidence; his speech is clearer (he used to have a speech impairment); his skills improved. Carryover is seen in school, where he used to have failing grades."*
>
> *"S was a good example of what makes Aspen Glow work. He has progressed in all phases of project activities. This is important, since it has carried over to his regular classes."*

Teacher assessments indicated that after participation in Aspen Glow, the students had gained in self-image. The teachers strongly agreed that Aspen Glow was good for the students' personal growth and self-understanding. The average rating was "2" on a scale of "7". A rating of "1" indicated strong agreement and "7" strong disagreement.

Participation in Aspen Glow was helpful with regard to the students' ability to relate and communicate to others, according to the teachers. The average rating was "5" on a scale of "7", where "4" indicated moderately helpful.

Teachers observed that after participation in Aspen Glow, the students felt more confident about themselves and their abilities. The average rating was "5" on a scale of "7", where "4" indicated no change.

Teachers were asked if participation in the program changed the students' sense of responsibility. The average rating was "2" on a scale of "7" with "1" indicating strong agreement. A student's parent reported to the teachers that she was able to leave her child at home without adult supervision, for the first time.

Participation in Aspen Glow also changed the students' sense of independence and self-reliance. Average rating was "3" on a scale of "7", where "1" indicated increased independence/self-reliance to a high degree.

The teachers reported that participation in Aspen Glow increased the students' overall motivation. Average rating was "3" on a scale of "7", where "1" indicated strong agreement. A teacher related that one potential dropout student, after failing a test on maintaining a checking account, asked to take the test again. After passing the second test, she demanded to show the results to the Director of Special Services.

Overall, teacher assessments indicated positive changes in student participants. A typical comment from one of the teachers describes the progress of student participants:

> *"The program gave K the opportunity to plan his education. He became very responsible in learning the various skills, teaching them to others, and trying to perfect them. He has improved greatly*

*this year. I feel Aspen Glow has given him a sense of accomplishment and pride in learning. He's worked very hard to learn the skills and teach them to others. He's also developed pride in his work and a sense of fulfillment from his education."*

Teacher assessment of the overall benefits of the project to both teachers and students indicated that the project is a highly worthwhile learning/teaching experience for teachers ("6.5" average on a scale of "7", where "7" indicates very high) and also for students ("6.5" average on a scale of "7", where "7" indicates very high). A typical teacher comment was, "Not only did I learn new skills personally, such as darkroom, layout, etc., being on the 'ground floor,' starting a new project has helped me grow professionally. Looking back to the summer of '80 and looking at the students today, there have been numerous changes, socially, emotionally, and academically."

In order to respond to the technical assistance/inservice needs of the project, teachers were asked to rate the need for additional/supplemental technical assistance and inservice. The following charts show the response (average rating):

| | Low | | Mod | | High |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| -Interviewing Techniques | O | | | | |
| -Community Contacts | | | | | |
| -Photography | | O | | | |
| -Darkroom Techniques | | | O | | |
| -Transcription | | | | | |
| -Story Development | O | | | | |
| -Layout | | O | | | |
| -Marketing | | | | ④ | |
| -Organizational Development | | O | | | |
| -Resource Development | | | | O | |
| -Staff Development | | | ③ | | |
| -Behavior Management | | ② | | | |

Teachers were also asked what had worked, what had not worked, and what they would have changed in the program. Sample responses included:

What Worked

-Team teaching.
-Being in a building away from the schools, an out-of-school setting.

-Dividing time and types of exercises among the three teachers.
-Having each teacher "specialize" in a specific skill area, such as photography or layout, in order to gain proficiency needed to instruct students.

What Did Not Work (Responses to these issues are shown in parenthesis.)

-Slow periods when students run out of activities (more supplimentary activities included).
-Some discipline problems (behavioral modification system enacted).
-Not being able to go to enough interviews with kids.
-Poorly structured 2½ hour class period (structured individual activities of 30 minutes to one hour duration).

What Would You Have Changed

-Coordination among the different schools, providing all students the same days off.
-Behavior modofication system (indicating rejection of same).

2. Ongoing Assessments of Students' Group and Individual Behaviors

Assessments of students' group and individual behaviors were conducted on a daily basis. Group behaviors monitored by the teachers included: punctuality, organization, job performance, completion of daily assignments, following directions and program rules, and appropriate interaction with adults and peers. Results from this ongoing assessment were used to develop instructional/intervention activities, provide support where appropriate, and as a determinator of letter grade. Ninety percent of the students performed well in all of the aforementioned areas.

3. Teacher-Developed Tests

Teachers developed tests to determine student knowledge of Foxfire-specific skills. These tests were also used to monitor student progress and develop instructional/intervention activities and as a determinator of letter grade. A significant majority of the students (85 percent) did well on the tests, with an average letter grade of "B" for the first and second semesters.

4. Analysis of Individual Educational Plan (IEP)

Regular student staffings were conducted to determine progress relative to the student's Individual Educational Plan (IEP), and/or to determine if modifications in the IEP were necessary. A sample IEP is included in the Appendices.

IEP analysis with reference to instruments utilized by the school district for initial screening/child-find, and initial diagnosis/assessment appears below. The parenthetic number following the title of each instrument/ procedure indicates the following code of use of the instrument/procedure:

1 = Initial screening/child-find
2 = Initial diagnosis/assessment
3 - Ongoing child evaluation/monitoring
4 = Overall program evaluation

| Instrument/Procedure (Use) | Availability |
|---|---|
| -Wide Range Achievement Test (2,3,4) | All |
| -Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale for Children--Revised (2,3,4) | Instruments |
| -Peabody Individual Achievement Test (2,3,4) | Commercially |
| -Metropolitan Achievement Test (2,3,4) | Available |
| -Gates-McGinitie (2,3,4) | |
| -Slosson Oral Reading Test (2,3,4) | |
| -Informal Reading Inventory (2,3,4) | |
| -Slingerland Screening Tests for Identifying Children with Specific Language Disability (2,3,4) | |
| -Sucher-Allred Reading Placement Inventory (2,3,4) | |
| -Test for Auditory Comprehension of Language (2,3,4) | |
| -Developmental Test of Visual-Motor Integration (2,3,4) | |
| -Detroit Test of Learning Aptitude (2,3,4) | |

A composite analysis of test data could not be conducted since each school (five different schools) had unique initial screening/child-find and initial diagnosis/assessment procedures. No compatibility of test data existed for the five different schools involved.

5. Parental Assessments

Parents were asked to assess child benefit through participation in Aspen Glow (see Appendices for sample form) and to communicate issues they felt relevant. A sampling of parental feedback regarding perceived benefits includes:

> *"I believe my son is communicating much better with adults, because of the interviews, etc. I'm hoping this will help him when he*

*applies for jobs in the future. I do know that the success he is having with Aspen Glow has improved his self-image."*

*"Yes, definitely! We feel M has gotten invaluable experience that he would not otherwise have received. He has learned to operate a camera and develop film. He has had the chance to meet many interesting people and learn first-hand how many of them have overcome personal tragedies. He has had the chance to communicate with people of varied age groups and backgrounds, to interview these people and put their stories down on paper in an interesting and informative way. He has had a chance to learn how to make bank deposits, write checks, and balance a checking account. He has had the opportunity to learn teamwork and the great sense of pride and accomplishment in seeing the finished product of that teamwork!"*

*"When our son entered Aspen Glow he had lost most of his interest in school and had a negative attitude. Aspen Glow has helped spark enjoyment in learning."*

*"R seems to like going to the Aspen Glow program. The only negative thing I have heard is in regard to transcribing the tapes, but that is because he doesn't like to write. He really seems interested in photography now. He has also talked about the different ways an article could be set up for printing."*

*"Most students are not self-motivated and need a little more understanding and push than they get in structured classrooms. Our son has received this help from Aspen Glow."*

*"Although these students are young adults, they don't always act as they should. I think the teachers should be commented for their patience and support."*

6. Participant Tracking and Program Impact

While resources are lacking for long-term, comprehensive follow-up of participants, an attempt has been made to track a sampling of Aspen Glow students after their program involvement concluded. Of seventeen cases examined by Arapahoe's Learning Support Services, only one student had withdrawn from school. Of those continuing in district educational programs beyond Aspen Glow, the following characteristics were documented:

A. Enrolled in Area Vocational Centers - 29%
B. Attending High School Programs ---
   With Continuing Special Education Servicing - 35%
   With Minimal (Itinerant or Consultative) Special Education Servicing - 18%
   Without Special Education Servicing - 11%
C. Current Grade Averages ---
   Above Average - 29%
   Average - 42%
   Below Average - 18%
   Failing - 11%

Without the Aspen Glow program having been offered, these seventeen students would have been placed in the following type of programs, according to district officials:

A. Self-Contained Resource Rooms - 35%
B. Resource Room/Basic Skills Programs - 47%
C. Basic Skills Program/Itinerant Servicing - 12%
(One of the seventeen students would have been serviced by a regular school program.)

Documentation of previous negative behaviors displayed by this group included:

A. Drug Use - 18%
B. Truancy/Attendance Problems - 23%
C. Potential Dropout Status - 23%
D. Severe Behavioral Control Problems - 11%
E. Difficulty Accepting Handicap or Developing Coping Skills - 11%

While this sampling admittedly does not offer a complete picture of the ninety-seven students serviced by Aspen Glow to date, an examination of the group does demonstrate a positive impact resulting from participation in the program. Additionally, Special Services personnel surveyed with regard to their perceptions of benefits offered through Aspen Glow involvement to the special education student population cited the following:

1. Attainment of Pre-Vocational Skills
2. Gains in Self-Esteem
3. Acceptance of Responsibility for Actions
4. Learning the Practical Application of Skills
5. Providing a Diversion to a "Regular" Classroom Setting (Through Alternative Means) for Students That Otherwise Would Have Been in Self-Contained Settings (Mainstreaming Objective)
6. Providing a Place Where Students Can Succeed and Feel Good About Themselves
7. Providing Opportunities for Students to Relate to the Public in Work-Type Settings

The Special Services Team from Euclid Junior High added, *"We did not anticipate that the success rate would be as high for these students"* (without Aspen Glow being offered). Over half of the seventeen students included in the sample were seen by their teachers (regular school) as having made significant gains in such affective areas as *self-esteem*, *confidence*, and *motivation*. Only one student continues to display an attendance problem, and none show drug-related behaviors.

B. Responsive Evaluation

Major issues examined within the Responsive Evaluation format include the following categories: Experiential Process Issues; Operational Issues, Expectations and Serendipity; Other Primary Concerns.

1. Experiential Process Issues

- Are the qualities of student experiences appropriate for each participant, and are they consistent with their IEP's? Are there opportunities available for peer teaching? Are tasks of appropriate size? Is there a proper effort to build one experience upon another?

Qualities of student experiences were found to be appropriate for each participant and were consistent with their IEP's. Initial tasks were appropriate and progressively increased as mastery of a specific skill level developed.

Teacher observations, student interviews, and parental assessments indicate that many opportunities exist within the program that encourage mastery of new skill areas. Students begin with little or no knowledge of specific skills, progressively mastering new skill levels as they procede through the program. New opportunities, created to learn higher level skills, remain consistent with their IEP's, which include all Foxfire-related skills and activities. Many of these situations require peer teaching and peer learning.

The following illustrative situation demonstrates the appropriateness of student experiences and the availability of opportunities for peer teaching and learning:

> *"I can't always jump in and do the job for them. On a one-to-one basis, a lot of times, you'll get impatient with the way he's doing it and you'll say, 'Oh, let me do that for you.' And you'll grab his work. I've found myself purposefully sitting back and watching a kid fail, knowing he was going to fail, and then coming in and saying, 'you need to do this, need to do that,' and watching him go back and do it. A good example is J. The kid went out on an interview and didn't plug the recorder in (laughs) . . . J has difficulty maintaining eye-contact because of a vision problem, and he turned off the man he was talking to. The man was a little bit annoyed with him during the course of the interview. We sent another student out, B, with him. B was very analytical about it. He noted everything that J did wrong.*
>
> *They came back here the next day, and J was very nervous about telling me that he had made all those mistakes. He was angry with B for telling me all the mistakes that he made. It provided a great situation for me, because when J and B came in, I sat in the chair and said, 'I think we'll just review what happened yesterday.' He said, 'Go ahead, B, tell him.' And B did. He listed all the things that had gone wrong on the interview. J's first response was to be angry at B for telling, for laying all this on the line. But then the three of us were able to sit there and just go through it.*

*J was able to understand. B was very diplomatic. He could have brought it out in front of the group, but he didn't. So I felt that B learned from the situation and J learned from the situation. He does have a responsibility to do things right, and knows that I am going to hold him accountable. J went back and did the interview again, and he did it by himself. He's the kid that's on his twelfth page of transcription."*

The following excerpt from a teacher interview is also indicative of the program's response to this issue:

*"Because of Foxfire, D has been put into a situation where he has success. He has improved upon the skills that he already had. The fact that he was nominated for an award by the Kiwanis Club--I think--is important. He was nominated on the basis that in the program he did a turn-around and saw the importance of it, saw the importance of what he was doing and was able to respond.*

*Aspen Glow gave him the opportunity to build light boxes. He's good with his hands. He designed the logo that is on the wall. He has been extremely helpful with new students that have come into the program. He's taking one of the kids--without any prompting from us--and putting him through the entire process. And I think that's neat. He spent hours--hours--working on transcribing. He went out on the interview with a new kid and asked questions on the interview, pointing out things that C needed to know. That interview happened to be with C's father. C was, you know, very nervous about it. Sometimes people assume that a kid knows what their father does, without asking questions. D made sure that he had the questions down.*

*He's not coming back to Foxfire next year. We were at the IEP conference two days ago and D showed up at the conference wearing his Aspen Glow T-shirt. The first question I asked him was, 'Do you want to continue on in Foxfire?' He said, 'Yes,' and then as the conference evolved, it became pretty obvious that he does need to go to the area vocational school . . . in the field of carpentry. I don't feel bad about the fact that he's not coming back, but at the same time he's seeing that he has something he has got to do. He's got to plan. And he's going through the ladder. His day is going to be from 7:30 until 4:00 in the afternoon starting next year. He'll be having carpentry at the area vocational school, and it's going to be a tough year, but I think he'll make it. I think he'll make it because he has learned what perseverance is here."*

- Are democratic decision-making opportunities for students a part of the offering?

Democratic decision-making opportunities are an integral part of the Foxfire process. Efforts are being made to maintain the integrity of the process. Students chose the name of their project, selected the stories they wanted to write, collectively decided on the formate and design of the magazine, and developed their own resource development activities.

Additionally, democratic decision-making opportunities have carried over to other areas beyond the project. A teacher comments, "Before, they did not have any choices or decisions to make; they had to go to classes. That was it. Now they have a choice, and as they go into high school, they have even more choices: a work study program, a vocational program, or Foxfire. The choices really exist because they have progressed to higher levels of education. They're feeling better about themselves, and they can make decisions now. Before, they didn't care about anything."

IDEAS' staff asked of this teacher if there exists within the Foxfire process, within the structure of how things occur, something that *requires* that students make decisions. The teacher's response was, "They have to be accountable for everything they write. They really found out after publishing the first magazine, when they got some letters from people who said, 'I didn't say that--I don't talk that way.' They had to make the decisions of how to write the article, how to present that person in a realistic and positive manner. And they really had to become accountable for all the work they did, whereas before, everything was 'so what.' "

Another teacher said, "They do have to make a lot of decisions. If they are given an assignment in the regular classroom, they are usually told exactly how to do it. It's done one way, and that's the way it has to be done. In Foxfire they have to make decisions on what photographs to take, what questions to ask, how to lay it out, how to write it, whether to keep it in a question/answer format, whether to put it in narrative form. It's *making* those kids decide on things. Before they sat back, and it was all decided for them. When we sit down as a group, we say, 'Okay, we have to put the magazine together. What's going to be on the first page? What's going to be the cover? I think the opportunities for decision-making have a direct bearing on such things as what they're going to take in school, what they're going to do now or in the future, whether they want to stay in the program, whether they don't, how they're going to handle their lives as far as home is concerned."

- Are there arrangements to increase responsibilities for students to manage money (i.e., disbursement decisions, check writing, planning future disbursements, budgeting, etc.)?

Increasing increments of responsibility occur through rotation of tasks relative to money management. Every student has the opportunity to maintain the books, make bank deposits, balance the accounts, handle circulation, budgeting, and resource development. Instructional activities also incorporate money management skills such as writing checks, making deposits, and making change.

•Are styles of teaching and classroom management compatible/conducive to the experiential learning process, such as:

-inducing an ethic of cooperation;

-encouraging student management of their own work (including individual and collective assignments) and personal assessment of their own progress; and,

-are students being encouraged to assume responsibility for the project as a whole?

At the outset, teachers found it difficult to alter their traditional styles of classroom management. The experiential nature of the Foxfire process enabled teachers to gradually adapt, modify, and change their teaching styles. During the first year, teachers were referred to as Mr. or Mrs. During the second year, students started calling teachers by their first names, no longer seeing them only as authority figures, but relating to them in other manners as well. A spirit of cooperation developed, particularly after publication of the first issue of the magazine.

2. Operational Issues, Expectations and Serendipity

•Are effective mechanisms at work to diminish inappropriate behavior? Does the behavioral modification system influence the Foxfire activities of students and teachers? Are the bead bracelets effective for some, or all, of the students?

Effective mechanisms within the Foxfire concept/process were at work to diminish inappropriate behavior. Initially, teachers were not aware that such mechanisms were at work, and it was not until the end of one program cycle and publication of the magazine (acting as a reinforcement) that teachers and students began to see that something was working. Inherent within the Foxfire process are mechanisms such as peer pressure, working toward a common goal and achieving it, developing self-confidence through increasing increments of skills development and responsibility, working in teams and working independently. Immediate reinforcement of success in learning results from the reality-based, purposive nature of Foxfire activities, including student accountability, interactions with community members, and the democratic climate underlying the process. As one student explained, "You have to take responsibility for the whole project. Otherwise, you won't be proud of it."

•Are facilities adequate to the needs of the project (e.g., darkroom, access to facilities as needed, is work space flexible via classroom dividers)?

With the introduction of the behavioral modification activity (colored bead bracelets used to denote negative points for each inappropriate behavior), IDEAS' staff was concerned that this activity would detract from the integrity of the Foxfire concept. Since this practice was initiated by the Assistant Director of Special Education, IDEAS' staff

did nothing to stop it. However, the bracelets did not produce any effect upon student behavior, and teachers voluntarily discontinued their use.

Much of the initial concern regarding "inappropriate behavior" resulted during the first year from facilities that were clearly inadequate, according to the students and instructors. The darkroom was improvised from an unused bathroom. There were no classroom dividers to facilitate the various activities occurring, many which require privacy and solitude. The classroom was small and students were often interfering with each other, which created behavioral problems and frustration for teachers and students alike.

Before the conclusion of the school year, however, after publication of the first issue, more adequate facilities were provided outside of the school setting, a beneficial change. Behavioral problems were alleviated, and the project enjoyed a more "professional atmosphere." Students identified with the project increasingly and group cohesiveness improved. Adequate space allowed different activities to occur simultaneously. A professional darkroom is accessible. There are three offices in addition to the main classroom. One is used as a central office where equipment and money is stored. Another room is used for the dictaphone (utilized in story writing).

Again, during the first year, transportation remained a real problem. Students were transported from their respective schools to the project site in a school that was remote from city bus lines, creating operational problems. With the change in site, this problem was eliminated. Additionally, provisions were made to authorize teachers to transport students for interviews and other activities.

- Are equipment and consumable supplies for project activities adequate?

Equipment and consumable supplies for project activities are adequate. Through sales of the magazine, the cookbook and donations, the project has been able to provide for additional equipment (including an additional three SLR cameras during the second year) when the number of students being serviced increased.

What is the division of labor between the participating teacher/advisors? Who has what responsibility for what? With respect to the division of labor, have the teacher/advisors divided up responsibilities among themselves as a means to maximize use of the human resources available?

Division of labor among the three teachers was a process that occurred naturally, depending upon teachers' strengths, inclinations, and project needs. Some tasks, both instructional and operational, were shared. All teachers learned the Foxfire specific skills relating to the entire process. Students were also rotated through tasks in order to maximize learning and mastery.

- Do project activities contribute to mainstreaming, and if so, how? Do the project's objectives coincide with the school district's special education plan?

The project requires that students conduct interviews with community people, present their project to local community and civic groups, and sell their magazine to the larger community. Other activities were specifically site-created (as in Aspen Glow where students from the Springs Institute for International Studies came to visit and to interact with the students with regards to their own cultures). All of these activities represent mainstreaming in its truest sense. In addition, a small percentage of regular education kids participated in the project. These students were referred by school counselors. In some cases, regular students contacted the special education administrative office and asked to be able to participate in the project, where their only other alternative would have been to drop out of school.

Project objectives compliment the school district's special education master plan. Administrators are pleased with the utilization of the Foxfire process in meeting the overall goal: to provide appropriate individual education plans and services to special education students. Career exploration objectives were also accomplished. Students investigate a variety of careers--whether or not they turn their investigations into stories or publish them.

Student initiatives were suprising and impressive. One of the students, for example, was curious about the career of a mortician. He asked his teachers if he could do an interview without the intention of writing a story or putting the story in the magazine. He was simply curious. He interviewed the mortician and learned that he did not want to be one. The same student then interviewed a helicopter pilot for a news program of a local TV station. This kind of student initiative and curiosity is pervasive in all the programs.

- Have the initial expectations of the teachers/advisors, parents, students, special education and other school administrators been realized through project operations?

Initially, teachers/advisors were wary of the democratic nature inherent in the Foxfire process. Teachers/advisors were fond of saying such statements as, "For this type of student, we have to maintain a balance between authoritarian and democratic instructional methods and intervention strategies." Teachers have had, however, to redefine their roles and modify their teaching styles and methods. Teachers/advisors were accustomed to directing students on a continual basis, which was dissonant to encouraging self-decision, democratic processes and student ownership of the project. Teachers/advisors changed their teaching and intervention styles, leaning more increasingly toward the democratic mode, evidence of the rapport established between students and teachers/advisors as a natural development of the project and leading to increased group cohesiveness and individual acceptance of responsibility.

Parents' expectations also changed radically. Parents were skeptical, initially, about the value of the project as a vehicle for attainment of basic and academic skills. The changes in students' motivation level and their enthusiasm to learn in this situation, however, significantly and positively impacted students' attainment of basic and academic skill levels, according to the parents. Many students improved their grades in other

subject areas, a carryover that can be, in part, attributed also to the development of listening skills through Foxfire interviewing and transcribing activities. As one student said, "Well, I've learned to listen better. When I was in all seven classes, I used to sit there and play with my pencil or write stuff on a sheet of paper and not pay attention to any of my teachers. But since I started in Foxfire, I've been paying much better attention to all of my teachers."

With these kinds of changes in their children's attitudes and behaviors, parents became more supportive of the project. In many instances, parents *insisted* that their children continue in the project during the second year. Parents also insisted that siblings be allowed to enroll in the project.

Initially, school administrators had a "wait and see" stance, relative to the project. Following the publication of the first issue of *Aspen Glow*, special education administrators were visibly supportive and allocated additional resources to the project. During the second annual Parents' Night, parents and members of the Special Education Advisory Council expressed satisfaction not only in program operations but also in the mature and enthusiastic conduct of the students. The following day many phone calls to the Special Education Director expressed support for the project and other positive feedback.

The strongest evidence of advocacy for the project came just prior to the end of the school year 1981-82. Faced with district-wide budgetary cutbacks, the Special Education Administration was reorganized and many special education services were cut. The Assistant Superintendent in charge of special education asked a special education administrator what would happen if Aspen Glow were eliminated. The reply was, "You'll get a lot of phone calls."

- Do parents perceive positive changes for behavioral carryovers in their children at home? Has there been any overt evidence where improved behavior has been rewarded?

Many parent reports of perceived positive changes and behavioral carryovers in their children have been provided to project staff. Parents indicated that they were extremely pleased with their children's development of motivations to learn. Some went so far in support of the program as to purchase for their children their own cameras and darkrooms.

- Has participation of youths resulted in serendipity? Are students, teachers/advisors, and administrators sensitive to serendipitous happenings? Are there acknowledgements and/or expressions of appreciation given?

There have been multitudinous accounts of serendipitous situations in the program. A teacher/advisor account follows:

> *"I've discussed how B is doing with his other two teachers and the psychologist. He comes to the project every day. He may not be involved with the group to the point where we all would*

*like him to be, but I've noticed a maturity in the way he related to the kids. It's slight, but we're dealing with a severely emotionally disturbed kid. There has been improvement. There are days when B is very erratic and very devious. Then there are days when B will just go off and do what he has to do, and he gets the job done.*

*I sent him out to sell magazines in downtown Denver to a lady I know who has a shop there. I walked into the shop two days later and the lady had nothing but praise for the kid. That wasn't B the manipulator. He was genuinely interested in what he was doing. He came across that way. The lady was no fool. She even wrote a letter to the district that said what she thought. Here was a kid in this project who was doing a terrific thing. And she still asks me about him to this day. That's great that he connected. He called her up to see if she needed more magazines. He was doing what he was supposed to be doing. He felt some sort of responsibility."*

Students, teachers/advisors, and administrators were receptive and sensitive to serendipitous situations. After the theft of a camera, the students got together as a group and discussed the incident. As a group, they felt they were being "ripped off." They all agreed that the camera had to be returned and nobody would make an issue of it. Before the week was over, the camera was anonymously returned to the Director of Special Education. That surprised everyone, including the administrators at the Special Education administrative offices.

The many changes in individual student behavior are in themselves serendipitous. One teacher related the following:

*"Some kids were teasing K about being in the project. In the past, K's normal reaction would have been to strike back physically. I was in the hallway and I was watching, and what he did was turn around and say, 'You try it! You try and come out with a magazine like we did.' And then he just turned on his heel and walked away."*

Relationships that the students are developing with community residents, particularly long-time residents in the community, open up many serendipitous experiences. Most of the participating students started out very shy, very low in self-esteem. According to one of the teachers/advisors, "They were afraid to call people on the phone." And one student reported, "The hardest thing with the first interview was the phone call--to set it up--because you don't know the guy. Once that's over, you feel pretty relaxed. But the day of the interview, you still don't really know who he is, what he looks like, or anything about him. You have to settle down and get the interview going. If it goes pretty smooth, it's easier the next time, but it's still pretty scary." After several interviews, students became adept at asking questions. Some humorous situations occurred during the interviews. One student asked a contact who had been a quadriplegic since birth if he had ever been in the army. Another asked a mortician how much money

he made. The mortician consistently evaded an answer, but the student persisted and finally deciding upon a salary range, asked "is that how much you make?"

Acknowledgement and/or expressions of appreciation are given when appropriate. For example, students have been given awards by the Kiwanis Club. For the most part, verbal acknowledgment is the common way of expressing appreciation. When an opportunity arises, such as being able to participate in a training workshop, the activity is utilized as a means of acknowledging a student's good work. Students, for example, have been rewarded with the opportunity to assist in training workshops in IDEAS' Foxfire/HEP project in Oregon and elsewhere.

3. Checklist Items and Other Primary Concerns

As part of the responsive evaluation format, teachers/advisors, administrators, and students were given the ongoing opportunities to respond to the following checklist items:

| (Scale: Low 1 2 3 4 5 High) | Aspen Glow 1 2 3 4 5 | Wickerwire 1 2 3 4 5 | Little Dry Creek 1 2 3 4 5 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Is the project sufficiently staffed? | x | x | x |
| Are the school administrators responsive to the needs of the project? | x | x | x |
| Is IDEAS being responsive to the expectations of students, parents, administrators, and teacher/advisors? | x | x | x |
| Is the agreement between IDEAS and the school district being honored by both parties? | x | x | x |
| Is support provided by IDEAS sufficient to meet the needs of the project (e.g., orientation, training, in-service, equipment)? | x | x | x |
| Is there sufficient communication mechanisms at work between everyone involved, including parents, administrators, teacher/advisors, and students? | x | x | x |

Other checklist items, not lending themselves to the above format, included:

•Does the IEP redirect or infringe on project activities in prescriptive ways that may hinder attainment of project objectives?

IDEAS' staff, teachers/advisors, administrators, and parents were in agreement that the IEP's were redirected to include Foxfire activities and objectives which, in turn, facilitated the accomplishment of IEP objectives.

•Do the students, teacher/advisors, and administrators possess an operating assumption that the students are capable of effectively participating in the adapted Foxfire learning process?

Students, teachers/advisors, and administrators had no operating assumption whatsoever relative to the students' capability of participating in the adapted Foxfire learning concept. Initially, there was a degree of risk-taking on part of the students, teacher/advisors, and administrators. But with the publication of the first issue of their magazine, this issue became irrelevant.

Additional issues relevant to the implementation and institutionalization of a Foxfire special education adaptation, as well as appraisals of the effectiveness and replicability of the model program, appear in the following concluding portion of this report. These conclusions are based upon information gathered from students, parents, instructors, district officials and related personnel through utilization of the Responsive Evaluation format.

## IV. CONCLUSION

The success of the adapted Foxfire model program in addressing the special needs of handicapped youth resulted from program characteristics worthy of note, if replication to additional sites is to be a future objective. Ample evidence exists to suggest that interest in such replications is wide-spread. Response to articles concerning the model program, as well as examinations of the subscription lists for the student publications (a great percentage of the subscribers are school districts, representing scores of communities in a number of states), indicates keen interest in the Foxfire concept itself. Replication, however, requires a commitment of resources beyond that of interest alone.

IDEAS has identified the following as primary conditions contributing to successful implementation of the model:

1) Administrative support
2) Appropriate instructional staffing
3) Adequate facilities and resources
4) Preservice training and technical assistance
5) Parental involvement

Administrative support is, of course, necessary for the successful institutionalization of any program designed to serve the special needs

student. Foxfire, as a non-traditional, community-based effort, can be easily misunderstood, and activities integral to the proper utilization of the concept can easily be subverted by uninformed, uncooperative administrators. It is important that preservice orientation activities be directed towards nurturing such administrative support, and that administrators at all levels of the educational hierarchy be a part of an ongoing effort aimed at creating awareness and understanding of Foxfire's operational requirements.

Likewise, the selection of instructors for the adapted Foxfire program must be based upon the instructors' *acceptance of* and *value* placed in the experiential processes of Foxfire. The teachers involved in projects generated into existence by funds from the Office of Special Education continue to be effective in their roles as Foxfire instructors/advisors. They are diverse in ethnic make-up, age, previous experience and personal characteristics, but they share a common appreciation of *direct experience* as a valuable instructional means, as well as an end in itself of worth. These instructors continually search for methods by which effective learning may occur beyond the structured classroom, within the community. At times, such teachers find themselves being "risk-takers," challenging the status-quo and accepted methods, an occurrence underscoring the necessity for administrative support of their endeavors.

For special needs students, the importance of adequate facilities and resources sufficient to complete Foxfire activities in efficient, timely manners is a significant requirement. A crowded classroom without space in which diverse Foxfire activities may occur simultaneously opens the program to student and staff frustration and, in turn, disruptive behaviors.

Resourceful, creative, self-reliant instructors could conceivably develop a project without technical assistance and training in Foxfire methodologies, but it would be a long and arduous chore. The need to reach a concrete and reinforcing point at critical times in the Foxfire process (such as the publication of the magazine within reasonable time lengths of student involvement) is only heightened when dealing with the special needs student.

Additionally, IDEAS has concluded that intervention strategies to redirect student involvement in the program towards positive, successful outcomes are, at times, necessary. Personnel experienced in the Foxfire concept can only aid the program achieve such objectives, ensuring that the Foxfire experience not be another reinforced failure for the special needs student, but rather a rewarding learning experience.

Lastly, parental involvement is a key also to program success, as it is undoubtedly with any innovative, non-traditional approach. Parents must authorize their children's community-based learning activities, which requires that they understand the nature of and value in such experiences. As is evidenced in the overwhelming support exhibited by parents of Aspen Glow students, Foxfire appears to be able to generate such parental involvement when the program is operated in a professional manner, responsive to parental wishes.